

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| | | *** | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/720,700 | 11/25/2003 | Masaru Kihara | 032134 | 3038 |
| | 7590 05/09/200 I, HATTORI, DANIEL | EXAMINER | | |
| 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW | | | ALEJANDRO, RAYMOND | |
| SUITE 700 WASHINGTO | N DC 20036 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1745 | , |
| • | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 05/09/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Advisory Action | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brie | f | | | | | |

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/720,700 | KIHARA, MASARU | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| Raymond Alejandro | 1745 | | |

| | Raymond Alejandro | 1745 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 01 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | • |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | wing replies: (1) an amendment, affice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m | lidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or a statutory period for reply expire to the statutory period for reply expire to the statutory period for reply expires to the statutory period for reply expires to the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event. | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin | g date of the final rejecti | on. |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | 06.07(f). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be | filed within two month | ns of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | e appeal. Since |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | • | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | ecause |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or | | | the issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | - | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 | * ** | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | Paralle Clark and a secondary | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | llowable it submitted in a separate, | timely filed amendme | ent canceling the |
| 7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro | | ll be entered and an e | explanation of |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | . • | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 10. | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | 6 | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | at before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidat | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i | ot be entered s necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S | al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(| ils to provide a 1). |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | it does NOT place the application i | n condition for allowa | nce because: |
| 12. ⊠ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. □ Other: | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>05/01/0</u> | 7 | |
| | , | Raymond Alejand | ro |

Raymond Alejandro Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1745 Continuation of 3. NOTE: a) New Issues: specific elements contained in the positive electrode were deleted or removed. The limitations concerning the Co-compound coating and the higher order-distorted crystal structure were also removed from claim 1. Specific compounds contained in the positive electrode were removed from claim 8;

d) Claims 11-18 are new but no finally rejected claim has been cancelled. .

RAYMOND ALÉJANDRO PRIMARY EXAMINER